

I would like to call to your attention today a measure which may well be the most significant with respect to the future welfare of our country and of the world that the Congress could enact in this session. I refer to the "Health for Peace" Bill -- a proposal for an international medical research program.

My interest in this program, which goes back to the time when Senator Hill introduced legislation in the Senate last year, has been quickened by a message which I have received from a very courageous young man, Dr. Thomas A. Dooley. Dr. Dooley, as many of you may know, is the young physician who has devoted practically all of his professional life to the healing of the sick in some of the remotest parts of Asia. He urges that the Congress act without delay to pass the Health for Peace legislation. Recently, he -- like thousands of others each year throughout the world -- fell victim to cancer. Following surgery, he plans to return to northern Laos and continue his heroic battle against disease among the population there.

I can assure you that Dr. Dooley's plea for passage of the Health for Peace Bill was not a selfish request. To the contrary, this young man's efforts -- mostly carried out on the back doorstep of the Chinese Communist stronghold -- have been to provide medical care and health service to those in need. But Dr. Dooley has seen, as he indicated to me, that there are many indirect benefits to be derived through health

research and the application of new scientific knowledge in improving the health of peoples everywhere and in changing the attitudes of oppressed people in favor of a free society.

The legislation proposed for an international medical research effort provides an ideal framework to do what Dr. Dooley and many other eminent witnesses have advocated before appropriate Committees of both the House and Senate.

Let me say at this point that I did not make the above statement lightly. It is a wholehearted recommendation based upon an informed opinion derived from much careful thought and attention and time given to the matter. It has been my privilege to have the opportunity to ~~have~~ participated in many discussions, here and abroad, about research; to have visited with medical researchers overseas from many nations; and to have been one of your Congressional representatives to several World Health Organization assemblies wherein health and health research were matters of profound import to the delegates of some 90 nations of the world.

My considered judgment is that we of the United States ought to embark upon this endeavor of international medical research with new vigor and new ways and increased means.

Last year I introduced into the House its first bill, companion to Senator Hill's, for expanded medical research through a new International institute ~~and~~ as a scientist-to-scientist program -- and I

spoke wholeheartedly for it because I believed then and I believe now that so much depends upon it.

On January 12 of this year, I re-introduced this legislation in the House. I rose and spoke on the Floor concerning it, recommending the declaration of the first truly international war upon disease through use of the tremendous, latent potential weapons for world health -- and peace -- that lie in medical research.

Again in the summer I repeated my endorsement of the proposed bill, in an improved and refined version that had had the benefit of the careful thought of many brilliant minds, both in our own bodies of Congress and among eminent scientists. What I said then, and also in January, I must reiterate now, urging that we declare a new world war against disease, because I want to make it crystal clear that my support of the bill in the "yesterdays" is as strong as my support today.

As I said at the first of this year:

The American Revolution was an idea translated into action. It inspired people everywhere to be free. America has continued to inspire them as a great, free nation. Today we have a parallel idea, a war and a revolution for freedom from disease. The international medical research program is, in a sense, an extension of the American Revolution. Let our second American Revolution be this world war against disease.

Now let me proceed to some of the cold facts about this war and revolution.

The proposed bill is a sound legislative measure because it provides for a scientific program, administered through scientific means, acceptable to and workable within the framework of the international scientific community, and valid as a method of achieving international cooperation in research, research training, research planning, and the interchange of research knowledge.

The program would be a scientific one, administered on a scientist-to-scientist basis; it is thus of science and by science, yet for the peoples of the world.

Oddly enough, the point I just mentioned is one that has proved to be a significant stumbling block in working out the details of this legislation in Committee. The increased U. S. participation in international research proposed by this legislation is not an aid program. It is not a welfare program. It is not comparable to commendable programs of this nature by which the U. S. assists others to improve their economic, defense, or welfare status by aid given according to geographic or similar factors of need. Yet, the Administration position has been for the centralization of authority in the President, with budget justification along with Mutual Security funds, and finally, delegation of operating authority --- but largely through the State Department.

The kind of medical research program envisaged by this legislation will provide support for scientific studies strictly on the basis of scientific merit only after thorough and painstaking technical, objective review within the scientific community. Only in this way can true progress be gained by exploiting scientific potential, wherever it may happen to be. I am extremely confident that an institute of international medical research, working within the already established scientific framework in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, can give outstanding leadership to U. S. participation in global research against disease.

No other method could satisfy criteria which any proposal for strengthening international medical research must meet. This is so for the fundamental reason that scientific inquiry and interchange and teamwork cannot be based upon anything but a method which not only permits but also requires the participation of the scientific community in the implementation and administration of research activities.

The proposed legislation assures this. It insures also that a focused and concerted scientific effort be mounted in many disease and health research fields not now receiving the attention they must have. It insures that research disciplines be brought to bear upon gaining new knowledge both of specific disease problems not now well studied around the world and of basic life processes -- and new knowledge here is essential to the greatest ultimate victories over disease.

Furthermore, in addition to international scientific collaboration in research studies themselves, the legislation provides new opportunities for research training, research planning and coordination, and interchange of scientific information -- all, it should be emphasized, working with international scientific bodies concerned with health research.

These points lead to a further problem that has been faced by the Committee in considering this legislation, namely, the level of support. In testimony that has been presented to the Committee, the Administration has been unwilling to offer a definitive budget figure that would permit this program to get under way. Senator Hill, in his original proposal and as the bill passed the Senate, called for an annual outlay of \$50 million. There is every reason to believe, based on the opinions of expert witnesses who have appeared to testify on the measure, that \$50 million would be more than adequate for initial implementation of the program. Mindful of the fact that this is an authorization -- not an appropriation -- may I urge that we get on with this vital order of business to avoid any possibility of delay that could defer this move until the next session of Congress.

In urging this action, I want to re-assure my colleagues that the past record of the National Institutes of Health as a steward of the public funds is ample reason for willingness to provide a program authorization in excess of its initial needs. Year after year, the NIH--with the aid of its scientific advisory bodies--has maintained a high standard of quality for the activities it has supported.

One further point in favor of the authorization at its present level is the opportunity it will allow for a realistic phasing of the initial stages of the program and for the establishment and carrying out of long-term goals.

I would like very briefly to enumerate some of the specific factors that illustrate why in my opinion this legislation deserves prompt support and action.

First, we may review briefly the nature and extent of present activities of the National Institutes of Health in international medical research. As you know, the NIH is charged by law with specific categorical missions. Though these missions are broad because the disease problems attacked are large, there are many limitations in terms of their objective of conducting and supporting research activities designed to provide knowledge about cancer, heart disease, mental illness, neurological diseases, and so on.

This is as it should be, for there must be concerted effort which has specific goals for delineable problems in discrete, though complex, disease fields.

The Institutes, therefore, have been rightly concerned with developing, in collaboration with scientists abroad, international research efforts. Yet each effort must be delineated in terms of a categorical mission.

The record of the National Institutes of Health's participation in international research in previous years shows clearly that, within our present legislative framework, it is not possible to realize to a desirable degree the true potential that already exists for the development of international medical research endeavors.

The Institutes can and should increase their international research efforts as is appropriate within the framework of their mission and appropriations. The proposed legislation does not abrogate, but protects this.

What is most significant, however, is the fact that the legislation provides the means for filling gaps, for seizing latent opportunities, and for establishing a general program enabling American scientific partnership and participation in world-wide medical research to an extent and depth hitherto impossible -- a research program likely to produce new scientific knowledge undreamed of today.

Thus, the new approach, envisaged by the creation of an Institute and a program for the purpose of aiding international cooperation in general medical research, would move us ahead on the road of scientific progress.

It is my belief, stemming from my visit abroad as well as from discussions in this country, that the new international medical research participation represented by the Institute and its program would meet

with warm acceptance by those concerned with research, on the part of both individual scientists and professional organizations, here and abroad.

The expressions of many scientists themselves, and of others concerned in research programs in this country, certainly indicate a belief in partnership and participation by the United States in international medical research on a stronger and better basis than is currently possible.

The attitude of Dr. Dooley and other disease fighters throughout the world were epitomized for me by the remarks of Dr. M. Lopez Herrarte, Minister of Health, Guatemala, who in response to my comments on the views of the United States toward international research and health activities said:

"The words of Congressman Fogarty of the United States of America bring us hope, and we are sure that all our countries will receive as a blessing any help that may be given to us in this respect."

It is quite clear, also, that we in the United States have a great deal to receive from international research activities as well as a great deal to give. I am completely confident that the needs for working together in international health are urgent and well recognized by the nations of the world, that the potential mechanisms for collaboration are well established and that much more productive activity could be undertaken through our passage of the legislation for expanded international medical research.

As Dr. Dooley has said, it would be a pity indeed if the world should have to wait another year for a program that could hold the key to an assured peace and to the ultimate control of disease. Dr. Dooley is a man who is making the time count. We, as a nation, should make the time count. And the time to act is now. I am sure that all of us will agree that medical research is one of the most affirmative international efforts that the United States could take. It is a goal which is not only practical and achievable, but symbolic of the highest aspiration of man to be at peace with his fellow man. It is, therefore, my firm feeling that we ought to enact the proposed legislation and make possible this new endeavor that will bring so many benefits to our own people and to people everywhere.